

Appln. No. 10/578,090
Response. dated May 17, 2010
Reply to Office Action of: April 16, 2010

Remarks

The present communication is responsive to the Official Action of April 16, 2010, in the nature of a restriction requirement. Claims 62-79 presently appear in this case. All of the claims have been subject to a unity of invention restriction requirement.

The examiner states that the present claims are directed to two groups as follows:

I) Claims 62-75, drawn to a method of treatment of a disease or disorder of the mucosa by administering anionic lipid assemblies; and

II) Claims 76-79, drawn to a method of prevention of a disease or disorder of the mucosa by administering cationic lipid assemblies.

The examiner states that the two sets of claims are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

Applicant hereby elects species (I), without traverse. The claims which read on the elected embodiment are claims 62-75. The non-elected claims have now been deleted without prejudice to the continuation of prosecution thereof in a divisional application.

Appln. No. 10/578,090
Response. dated May 17, 2010
Reply to Office Action of: April 16, 2010

Prompt consideration on the merits and allowance of
all of the claims now present in the case are earnestly
solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By /rlb/
Roger L. Browdy
Reg. No. 25,618

Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\C\cohn\Barenholz17\Pto\2010-05-17Response.doc